

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of Claims**

After the above amendments, claims 1-6 are pending. Claims 1 and 4 are independent.

### **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over HENRIE et al (US 2002/0099878 A1)**

Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over HENRIE et al. (US 2002/0099878 A1). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections because HENRIE et al. does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. An embodiment of Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 1 provides:

1. A portable terminal communicably coupled to an external accessory, the external accessory being one of a plurality of external accessories, each of the plurality of external accessories being a different type and having differing functions, comprising:
  - an earjack comprising a plurality of communicable contacts for communicably coupling the external accessory via one or more of the plurality contacts, wherein a number of contacts used and a usage of each contact varies depending on the type of the communicably coupled external accessory;
  - an analog-to-digital conversion (ADC) section for converting a resistance value of the communicably coupled external accessory into an ADC value;
  - a memory for storing ADC reference values of the plurality of external accessories; and
  - a controller for controlling the ADC section to convert the resistance value of the communicably coupled external accessory into an ADC value, determining the type of the communicably coupled external accessory by comparing the converted ADC value with the ADC reference values stored in the memory, controlling the number and usage of the plurality of contacts to correspond to the communicably

coupled external accessory, and performing a function of  
communicably coupled external accessory (emphasis added).

HENRIE et al, the reference cited by the Examiner, teaches an interfacing technique for selecting a type of connection. More specifically, HENRIE et al. discloses connecting a PDA via a cradle and a connection cable to a computer system. The aim in HENRIE et al. is to determine the type of communication interface (USB, RS232, etc.) by determining the type of the connection cable being used. The type of the communication interface is ascertained in order to determine which type of application and driver to execute. Thus HENRIE et al. operates to determine which software to execute for a given communications protocol.

By contrast, claim 1 as amended calls for “each of the plurality of external accessories being a different type and having differing functions.” Nothing in HENRIE et al discloses nor suggests external accessories being a different type and having differing functions. At best, HENRIE et al discloses external accessories being a different type as in USB or RS232 cable for example. However, HENRIE et al teaches only a single function for the external accessories, namely data communications. According to an embodiment of the applicant’s invention the various external accessories have differing functions. For example, an earphone function, an FM stereo function, an external flash function or an external camera function. Thus, HENRIE et al fails to disclose “each of the plurality of external accessories being a different type and having differing functions” as recited in claim 1.

Further, claim 1 recites that “a number of contacts used and a usage of each contact varies depending on the type of the communicably coupled external accessory.” The Examiner cites element 180 of figure 3 as the element comprising the contacts. However, nothing in HENRIE et al discloses or suggests that the number of contacts used varies depending on the type of the communicably coupled external accessory. Moreover, nothing in HENRIE et al discloses or suggests that the usage of each contact varies depending on the type of the communicably coupled external accessory. According to an embodiment of the applicant’s invention the various external accessories use a differing number of contacts with differing usage of each contact depending on the type of the external accessory. For example, an external flash accessory uses five contacts while a Bluetooth accessory uses six contacts. Further, one of the

contacts used for the external flash accessory acts as a battery supply whereas the same contact when used for the Bluetooth accessory is a 3V supply. Therefore, HENRIE et al fails to disclose that "a number of contacts used and a usage of each contact varies depending on the type of the communicably coupled external accessory."

Additionally, claim 1 calls for "controlling the number and usage of the plurality of contacts to correspond to the communicably coupled external accessory." However, nothing in HENRIE et al discloses or suggests controlling the number and usage of the plurality of contacts to correspond to the communicably coupled external accessory. Therefore, HENRIE et al fails to disclose "controlling the number and usage of the plurality of contacts to correspond to the communicably coupled external accessory."

Accordingly, Applicant's independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 3 (which incorporates by reference all of the features of base claim 1) are not anticipated by HENRIE et al at least for the above reasons. Independent claim 4 and its dependent claim 5 comprise similar subject matter to that of claims 1 and its dependent claim 3. Therefore, the above arguments equally apply to independent claim 4 and dependent claims 3 and 5, and thus claims 3-5 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over HENRIE et al (US 2002/0099878 A1) in view of HELLBERG (US 6,742,061 B1)**

Examiner rejected claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over HENRIE et al (US 2002/0099878 A) in view of HELLBERG (US 6,742,061 B1). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections because HENRIE et al and HELLBERG, neither alone nor in combination, discloses, suggest or render obvious all of the limitations of the claims. Claims 2 and 6 are dependent claims and are therefore allowable for the reasons given above by virtue of their dependence on claims 1 and 4.

Appl. No. 10/727,656  
Amdt. dated December 21, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 30, 2005

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ch Michel', written over a horizontal line.

Christian Michel  
Reg. No. 46,300  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: December 21, 2005

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680  
Main: (202) 659-9076  
Direct: (202) 530-7372